DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 971 95 JC 770 555

TITLE Program for Youth and Community Studies. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Staten Island Community Coll., N.Y.; State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook.
SPONS AGENCY Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 25 Nov 76
NOTE 65p.; Appendix I has been deleted due to poor reproducibility

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Community Services; Extension Education; *Field Experience Programs; Financial Problems; *Higher Education; *Human Services; *Junior Colleges; *Paraprofessional Personnel; Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; Social Services

ABSTRACT

The Youth and Community Services Program was designed for the education of human services professionals and paraprofessionals. Two parallel programs were implemented in 1973--a two-year program at Staten Island Community College and a four-year program at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. At Staten Island, the curriculum involved three components: field work in community institutions; classroom courses in theory, urban institutions, and basic skills development and training; and independent study. The program was offered on-campus and at three off-campus sites. This document compiles the final report of the Staten Island program, an evaluation of the Staten Island program by an outside evaluator, and the final report of the Stony Brook program. Fiscal and institutional problems in the implementation of non-traditional programs are reviewed and final recommendations are presented. (RT)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

ED146971

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT OF

# PROGRAM FOR YOUTH AND COMMUNITY STUDIES

A Jointly Sponsored Program by

The College of Staten Island

and

State University of New York at Stony Brook

November 25, 1976

JC 770 555

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Final Report: The College of Staten Island

Part I: History and Introduction.

Part II: Programmatic Responses to Special Problems Encountered.

Part III: A Descriptive Evaluation by Dr. George L. Mims, Director of Special Programs, Pace University, N.Y., N.Y.

Appendix I: Description of courses developed by Youth and Community Studies Program.

Appendix II: Statistical Portrait of Youth and Community Studies Program.

Final Report: The State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Final Report:

The College of Staten Island.

November 25, 1976

Annual Report and Final Evaluation for

the Fund for the Improvement of

Postsecondary Education

PART I

The Youth and Community Services Program at Staten Island Community College began after nearly a year of planning in September 1973. The program was funded by a FIPSE grant. Refundings proposals were submitted and accepted for the academic years 1974-75 and 1975-76.

The Youth and Community Services Program was designed to deal with the education of human services professionals and para-professionals. The first year of the program included the delivery of educational services to a group of campus students in addition to two community groups. During the initial planning period, in the Summer of 1973, the SICC faculty contacted community agencies in Bedford Stuyvesant, Brooklyn and the Lower East Side of Manhattan. With the active participation of the community agencies a freshman class of 25 to 30 students was recruited in each area.

In the Spring semester of 1973-74 academic year a community group center in East Flatbush in the Boro of Brooklyn was also recruited.

The YCS Program was conceived and initiated at a time when budgetary considerations did not have to play as large a part in program planning as currently. Because of problems beyond the power of the YCS Program or the Community College to remedy, in the beginning of its third year, the YCS Program was limited to one off-campus extension sites.

As we begin our fourth year now fully funded by the College of Staten Island the YCS Program consists of one extension site in Bedford Stuyvesant and a group of students on campus.

The future of the Bedford-Stuyvesant program is seriously in doubt. It appears that the YCS Program will be confined to its program for on-campus students.

PART II

Programmatic Responses to Special Problems Encountered

In the course of our three years the YCS faculty has encountered many problems that though of specific relevance to this program may have general importance to others. In this section we will specifically discuss three areas in which program responses were generated which may be of interest and importance to other educators.

A. Curriculum:

We are attempting to offer our students, those on the S.I.C.C. campus and those in our satellite extension project, an integrated educational program. We do not believe that this goal can be achieved by simply providing practical field experience for non-working students or "book learning" for full-time working students. A curriculum that is educationally meaningful must integrate the practical and the theoretical approaches so that each will dialectically react upon the other. "Book learning" must be rooted in practical work experience, while simultaneously providing a transcendent, critical perspective on the experience. To bifurcate field and classroom study, to separate them by segregating the faculty and/or time periods devoted to each is to disintegrate the educational experience.

The Youth and Community Studies is designed to meet the specific needs of those who have career plans in the human services: law, social work, teaching, planning and psychology and counseling. Unlike other skill training programs in these areas, we are not only providing careful supervision of work experience and an opportunity for the student to reflect on the nature of the work performed, but also a broad social-scientific background in the theoretical underpinnings of this work. Reading and writing,math and science are important skill areas intrinsic to all educational development programs. We offer courses in these subjects oriented to the specific needs of people working in the human services.

1. Field Work

YCS Program in its attempt to provide an education for Human Services Professional has designed a curriculum that integrated field work with class room work. We considered the required work component, not as an addition to, but as an integrated and integral part of the academic program. Our objective has been to provide students with the skills essential for developing a critical prospective on the capacities of human services agencies to define and deliver services.

We have pursued the establishment of field work components in our extension college sites as well as for our on-campus program.

In our extension college programs, we have attempted to integrate field work with the job requirements of those YCS students who are full-time workers.

Students on the SICC campus are required to undertake group work projects in institutions within the local community. These may be hospitals, public schools, mental health centers, drug programs, or other suitable institutional contexts. The group project is undertaken by all students assigned to a specific institution with the approval of the supervisors within the institution. They may undertake to plan and execute a new program, perform a piece of original research designed to meet institutional needs, or offer systematic evaluations of the institution's activities.

2. Classroom Work

In its approach to classroom work the YCS Program has developed a sequenced correlated Liberal Arts Program.

The required classroom work consists of the following component parts:

a. Theory Courses.

Community Studies I, II, III, IV. This sequence of courses has been designed to introduce the YCS student to the primary terminologies, and the basic methodological and conceptual apparaiti of the Social Sciences and Humanities. Our focus throughout these courses is the city as community and social environment. The explicit objective of these courses is to provide students with the methodological and conceptual tools necessary in any systematic and in-depth analysis of urban problems. Students are introduced to these areas of Social Science and Humanistic knowledge with continual reference to their direct relevance to the tasks of Human Service professionals in an urban environment.

b. Urban Institution Courses.

This four course sequence has been designed to acquaint students with the theoretical presuppositions, historical background, and the role of Human Service professionals and para-professionals in four central institutional areas of urban life: education, social welfare, health care delivery, and law. These courses are structured to include small group action organizing projects and on-site observation of agencies in each institutional area. We have attempted to recruit as instructors for these courses professionals who have substantial work experience within each institutional area.

c. Skills Development and Training.

We have developed a Communication Skills course sequence for our extension college sites. For skills development in mathematics and natural sciences we are at present utilizing staff from other SICC departments and programs, both on campus and in our extension college projects.

3. Independent Study

In addition to the field work and classroom work we have built into the original curricula design a third component: Independent Study. This component has been designed to meet the individual academic needs and/or career objectives of our students. Each YCS student is expected to undertake at least one Independent Study project for a minimum of 3 credits. These study projects carry as a requirement the design and successful completion of a substantially researched and argued term paper.

B. The Extension College: Towards a New Educational Model for the Human Service Professional

1. Introduction

The Youth and Community Studies Program at SICC began operations in September 1973. The existence of a program based off campus was at first regarded by the staff as merely another learning site, but has now assumed an entirely different significance.. We have begun to think of our community learning sites in terms of the concept "extension college".

The extension college is not to be confused with traditional concepts of adult extension programs that have been offered by city and state universities. The traditional type of program offers discrete courses either for credit or for the purpose of skills development or general knowledge. In the first instance students are required to continue their education in some resident program located on the college or university campus. In the second instance the adult attends classes for his/her own sake without regard to the achievement of a credential.

The extension college concept as we see it suggests that adults working in ordinary jobs or in human service institutions within their own residential community will have the opportunity to enroll in a degree granting program without attending classes located primarily on the college campus. The extension college is founded on the premise that a high level academic program with internally consistent course content can be integrated within work and life experiences of its students. It is oriented toward a redefinition of learning that deliberately is interdisciplinary.

2. In Defense of Off-Campus Program.

The "boom" is over. The only remaining question is how deep and wide the "recession".

When times were good, the college opened wide its doors, looking beyond the campus to the potential but undeveloped student populations that had not yet been identified or identified themselves as "college material".

One of the most successful outreach tools was the development of extension site college centers, located off campus in areas underserved by public and private higher education. These college centers, almost from day one, attracted a stream of students who, until then, due to pressures of finance, family and work, as well as those often unarticulated psychological and social barriers historically separating campus and community had remained outside the domain of higher education.

The era of expanding budgets for public colleges and universities is over. No longer will there be money to spend or places to raise funds for new expansive and innovative programs. Budgetary questions will, for the foreseeable future, be concerned almost exclusively with curring expenses in all directions.

How will these cuts be made? Will priorities be assigned vis-a-vis the traditional on campus and the more recently established off campus programs? Will the college redefine its mission to include only those off campus programs which are located on Staten Island? These are legitimate questions which deserve the closest scrutiny.

There are those who will argue, and with logic, that in a time of budgetary constraint, this and every other institution must consolidate its services, pruning away the inessential in order to protect the essential. With a reduced budget, some programs, once affordable, become simply too comparatively expensive to be retained. The money necessary to fund them,it can be argued, would more efficiently be used to shore up badly underfunded but "essential" programs.

In this discussion, it must be assumed that the educational content of the on campus and off campus programs are comparable. Arguments could be made on the relative merits of each, but these would be more polemical and speculative than based on real, quantitative or qualitative, data.

The argument we wish to present is that the extension site off campus programs provide the communities and students they serve as well as the institution itself with real benefits that cannot be reproduced elsewhere.

To eliminate these programs would no doubt save costs, but the benefits lost to the institution would far outweight the dollars saved. Furthermore, the money saved by eliminating off campus programs, or substantially reducing them, would still not be substantial enough to compensate for that which would have to be cut from campus programs.

The off campus programs should not be immune from budget cutting, But, in the long run, it would be foolish and detrimental to the institution as a totality, to cut much more from these smaller programs than from other college programs.

When cuts are made on campus, they can be absorbed, though with difficulty. When made off campus, every reduction in expenditure is directly translated into a reduction in students. No matter how deep the on campus cuts, students do not have such alternatives. To eliminate off campus programs is to eliminate off campus students.

3. Benefits to Communities and Individual Students from Off Campus Programs.

We will not enumerate the benefits to the communities served by off campus centers and to the students who attend these centers. There is, we believe, no argument with the overall success achieved at those centers which have continued to offer courses over the last three years.

4. Benefits to Institution Derived from Off Campus Programs.

a. Maintenance of enrollment figures. As we have stated, the period of expansion in higher education has come to an end. The last of the "baby booms" has come and gone. Demographic projections for the coming decades show an absolute decline in the "college age" percentage of the total population. These projections are translated into predictions of static enrollments in higher education, at least through the decade of the 1990's.

The effect of this on public and private institutions must not be underestimated. No college or university can any longer expect a surplus of potential students to draw on. The institutions that survive and prosper through the coming decades will be those which can maintain, if not increase, their share of a dwindling or static student population. College programs must reach out to students traditionally excluded from higher education, particularly those who are older with full time jobs or household responsibilities. It is these students who, in future years, will have to compensate for the decrease in the "college age" percentage of the total population.

The off campus programs have been especially successful in enrolling and retaining these non-traditional students. They are valuable to the institution because they can draw on a pool of potential students that are outside the reach of many on campus programs. The off campus centers can also serve as an entry point for students who, after a transition semester or year, may want to transfer to campus programs which provide specific courses not available off campus. In coming years, as the public colleges on Staten Island are federated, the off campus programs will, if maintained at near current funding levels, be able to supply both lower and upper divisions with students who would not otherwise have attended Staten Island Community or Richmond College.

Because these off campus programs generate their own students, the cost-effectiveness must be evaluated differently than on campus programs which draw from the pool of those who have already chosen or been assigned to the Staten Island institutions. One demonstrable benefit of the off-campus programs to the institution as a totality is precisely this capacity

to "generate" additional FTE's which will be translated into increased funding for the institutions as a whole.

b. Availability of field work sites. As more and more campus programs begin to offer integrated work/study programs with field work components, the task of securing enough field work assignments with reasonable supervision grows more difficult. The off campus programs with specific and concrete connections in local communities can offer access to specific field work sites otherwise outside the domain of the Staten Island colleges.

c. Faculty growth. As the vast majority of faculty members who have taught off campus will testify, the students and learning environments off campus offer a range of educational problems and potentials that cannot be replicated on campus. Those who have taught off campus have learned much about their disciplines and their pedagogy from applying their skills in a different situation than that of the traditional college classroom. This experience has, in many cases, made them better teachers, on and off the campus.

5. Cost Analysis.

It is often assumed that off campus programs are less cost-efficient than on campus ones. Though off campus programs administrators have often in the past been less cost conscious than their on campus counterparts, we believe that a careful consideration of comparative costs will not prove detrimental to the cost efficiency potential of off campus programs. Though we, at this moment, lack the hard data to compile such figures or make such projections, we wish to point out several factors that must be taken into account when off campus programs are compared to on campus ones in regards to cost efficiency:

a. As we have already stated, off campus programs generate their own FTE's rather than draw on those already committed to the Staten Island institutions. All funds derived from off campus FTE's are then additional to the regular budget. They would not be available if these programs did not exist.

b. Off campus programs have minimal or no OTPS costs. All rent and maintenance costs are assumed by the local communities themselves. When the Staten Island colleges are consolidated on one campus and space is put at a premium, off campus programs which can increase the institutional FTE total without incurring added space costs will prove even more valuable.

c. Off campus programs have in the past and will to a greater extent in the future be funded in part by the local community agencies which have directly or indirectly sponsored them. Such funding will include (and in some instances already does) staffing costs as well as OTPS costs.

6. Conclusion.

The institutions of higher education on Staten Island face a difficult future. There is no question but that funding available for these institutions will not in the foreseeable future be what it has been in the recent past. Priorities must be established, decisions made on what must be cut and how deeply.

From our perspective as participants in the off-campus programs, we believe it would be unwise to eliminate or to reduce these budgets more than those of the on campus programs.

There is no disagreement that the quality of education is comparable off-campus and on. We also believe that the cost-efficiency of programs off-campus have the potential to reach students who would otherwise remain outside the boundaries of higher education altogether. The off-campus programs provide these students with an education, their communities with a direct service, and the colleges of Staten Island with innumerable benefits that cannot be reproduced elsewhere. One of these but by no means the most important, is the additional revenues derived from the new FTE's generated by the off-campus programs.

In this report we have tried to outline some of the benefits to the institution offered by the off-campus programs, those on Staten Island and off. We believe that these benefits far outweigh the monetary gains that would be achieved if those off-campus programs were eliminated. No matter how much money is saved from cutting back or discontinuing the off-campus programs, those on-campus would still have to endure substantial cuts of their own.

We urge that, when cuts must be made those suffered off-campus are no greater than those on-campus. To proceed otherwise would in the long run do more harm than good, to the colleges of Staten Island.

C. Remediation: Problems & Programmatic Responses

In the middle of our first academic year we discovered that the YCS program was obliged to assume major responsibility for the development of reading and writing skills among many of our students who were enrolled in the extension college program. We responded to this problem by hiring Dr. Carol Lopate, anthropologist and writer and Mr. Henry Evans, former Director of the SEEK program at Hunter College of C.U.N.Y., both of whom have had extensive experience in the design and implementation of communication skills remediation courses for "Open Admission" students in the City University system. With these individuals, we have developed a rigorous and effective literacy program.

This program has been designed to overcome the artificial distinction between remediation and content courses. We are attempting an integration of skills development and cognitive learning, of social science content and writing workshop courses in a four semester sequence of classroom and tutorial study.

The program, as now designed, depends to some extent on staff continuity from semester to semester. It presupposes a core staff of at least four (two writing and two social science/humanities specialists) to work with students, individually and in groups, throughout the four semester sequence.

Although this basic literacy program is pursued within all YCS courses, major emphasis is placed on communication skills development in those courses taught by core staff: the theory courses (see Part II ,section 2A) and the skills development or Writing Workshop courses (see Part II, section 2C).

FIRST SEMESTER

The entering student will be required to take four credit Fiction Writing Workshop. A substantial portion of each classroom session will be spent on basic grammar. Strunck and White's, The Elements of Style has been used as text in this regard. Writing assignments will be made on a regular basis. Thes e writing assignments will be short story prose, poetry and plays. We have discovered that students learn more readily to apply the basic grammatical principles in these contexts than when completing assignments in expository essay writing. Assignments will be corrected by the instructor and, when applicable, presented to the class for discussion and evaluation. Group assignments, such as the writing of short plays, will also be made. In each and every case these assignments must be handed into the instructor.

All writing assignments, in the Writing Workshop and the theory courses, will in the first semester be initially corrected only for the following three basic grammatical constructions:

1 - verb-subject agreement
2 - pronoun-antecedent agreement
3 - complete sentences

As students gain mastery over these constructions, the instructors will begin to introduce and correct for other grammatical and syntactical errors. Instructors in theory and Writing Workshop courses will, of course, be expected to comment on the content of each written assignment, no matter what the level of communication skills attained by the individual student.

Students will also be required to take Youth and Community Studies I in this first semester. The assigned reading in this course is primary source material from major Western theoreticians, among others, Freud, Marx and Weber. The classroom procedure is rigorous "Explication du texte."

The first reading assignment is gone over in class before a homework assignment is made. Students read together from the text, sentence by sentence, phrase by phrase, when necessary. With continual input from the instructor, each sentence is broken into its simplest components and deciphered. The first class usually proceeds very slowly. It is not uncommon to spend the two hour period on the exegesis of one lengthy paragraph. It is not uncommon to spend the two hour period on the exegesis of one lengthy paragraph.

The first homework assignment made is an extremely brief one. Students are asked to read by themselves 3 to 4 times the amount that has been gone over in class. Thus if the classroom session only got as far as the second page of Freud's Civilization and its Discontents, the homework assignment would be an additional three pages. The second classroom period would proceed to explicate these additional passages, but highlight the pages read rather than cover them sentence by sentence. By the third assignment students should be able to double their reading time and rate of comprehension. The fourth class assignments would be of normal length, depending on difficulty from 50 to 100 pages a week.

For the fifth class, students will be asked to prepare a brief written assignment. Each student will be assigned a brief 3 to 5 page section of the assignment. They will be asked to translate this section into their own words for presentation to the class. After class presentation these papers are handed in. The instructor corrects but does not grade each of these papers for content and the three basic grammatical principles enumerated earlier.

Students will in the latter part of the first semester be asked to write 3 to 5 page papers on assigned topics. They will be presented with several choices for each paper and each topic choice will be phrased in the form of a question to be answered.

SECOND AND THIRD SEMESTERS

The Writing Workshop will be expanded to include expository writing and the Literature of the City. In this and all other YCS courses written assignments will be required and corrected for grammatical constructions additional to the basic ones emphasized in the first semester. The writing assignments for second year courses include such items as the following:

-interviews
-logs
-letters
-memoranda

In the latter part of the second semester and in the third semester students will be required to write 5 to 10 page term papers with bibliographies and footnotes, when applicable. These papers will be corrected for grammatical syntactical constructions, spelling and content. Students will be expected to state a proposition, develop an argument, provide evidence to substantiate that argument, introduce and conclude their papers.

FOURTH SEMESTER

The fourth semester students will be required to take a six credit course entitled Senior Thesis. This course will be team taught by a social scientist and a writing specialist. Successful completion of this course is an absolute prerequisite for graduation. The writing of the Senior Thesis will proceed

in an orderly manner through the following stages:

1. Topic Selection

2. Course Selection

With the aid of faculty, students will investigate and evaluate the potential sources from which information on their topic can be gathered. Students will be expected to choose at least three full-length books or an appropriate number of articles as source material. They will also be encouraged to utilize as sources of information on their topic:

a - oral history archives
b - visual media resources
c - personal interviews

A written bibliography or annotated listing of source material must be submitted upon completion of this stage.

3. Students will be required to hand in summaries of each book or article read and/or logs of interviews or other media consulted. Their summaries will include both an abstract of the argument and a discussion of the central terminologies utilized in each book.

4. Students must pursue a critical analysis of two of the concepts met in the process of investigating their source material. This analysis will include a critical investigation of the logical and historical presuppositions of the concepts elected for presentation.

5. Proposition statement

Students will be required to hand in a brief (no more than two pages) statement of their topic as it has now been delineated and defined. This statement should include the projected direction of the argument that will be presented and ways in which source material will be utilized as evidence to illustrate and substantiate this argument. If desired students may hand in a formal outline of the projected term papers instead of this statement.

6. First Draft

7. Corrections of First Draft and Conference with Faculty

8. Final Draft

PART III

The following department evaluation was conducted by Dr. George Mims and submitted on June 1, 1976.

Dr. Mims was chosen to undertake this evaluation by Dean Henry Harris, Associate Dean of Experimental Programs and by Dr. David Nasaw, Acting Director of Youth and Community Services Program.

# A DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION

# OF THE

# YOUTH AND COMMUNITY STUDIES PROGRAM

# OF

# STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

George L. Mims
June, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS


I. Background of Youth and Community Studies Program.....page 1.

II. Procedure and Description of Students.....page 2.

III. Visitations-Campus and Community.....page 3.

-Staten Island Community College.....page 3.

-Bedford Stuyvesant.....page 4.

-Administration and Faculty Offices.....page 5.

-All-Day Program Evaluation.....page 5.

IV. Youth and Community Studies Program's Administration, Faculty-Staff, and Curriculum.....page 5.

-Supportive Services.....page 10.

-YCS Student Identification with SICC.....page 11.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Program Development.....page 12.

# A DESCRIPTIVE EVALUATION OF THE YOUTH AND COMMUNITY STUDIES PROGRAM OF STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

## I. Background

The Youth and Community Studies Program of Staten Island Community College was initiated in Fall, 1973. It has experienced several changes and has had several evaluations. These evaluations have attempted to assess the goals and effectiveness of this innovative program.

For a period of time, Youth and Community Studies had off-campus sites at East Flatbush (The Loft) and the Lower East Side. (Both are closed.) Presently, programs operate at the Bedford Stuyvesant center and the Staten Island Campus. This descriptive evaluation specifically includes visits and observations at the main campus and Bedford Stuyvesant center. These occurred on May 17th and May 24th, 1976. Also, an all-day student evaluation of YCS was held on May 24th. (This is described later in the report.)

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine how effectively the program has achieved its goals as far as an evaluation can determine in a limited period of time. Some program concerns will be discussed in detail. In other instances, only cursory descriptions will be mentioned. This report is developed to deal specifically with the operational aspects of YCS. Its philosophical and social positions appear to be adequately defined. In addition, this report will suggest ways and methods of handling many of the

concerns expressed by students and faculty. Moreover, recommendations and conclusions will be made regarding alternative ways of dealing with many of the program's goals and outcomes.

Inasmuch as YCS has had several evaluations--internal and external--this report will, no doubt, cover some of the areas previously assessed. This report complements the evaluation by Brown and Reid (1975). YCS administration and staff should determine how effectively they have handled problems and concerns described in that report. Moreover, this report will attempt to raise new concerns and challenges--hopefully it will point to new directions.

II. Procedure and Description of Students

Data was collected and insights developed in interviews with faculty-administration and students. In addition, visits were made while classes were in session. As indicated, this evaluator visited the main campus and the Bedford Stuyvesant center. The visits occurred on May 17th and May 24th. In order to become familiar with YCS, a copy of the Program's general description and other reports were reviewed.

The YCS program is composed of approximately ninety (90) full-time students and twenty (20) part-time students. There are approximately fifty (50) full-time students at the Staten Island Community College and forty (40) full-time students at the Bedford Stuyvesant center. The students at Bedford Stuyvesant

appear to come largely from low-income families as contrasted with students at Staten Island Community College who are members of working-class families (blue collar). Many of the students at both sites are employed in various civil service and clerical jobs. It should be noted that students at Bedford Stuyvesant are Black and Hispanic--almost equally divided. While the program students on the SICC campus are largely white, some are Black and Hispanic.

III. Visitations--Campus and Community

SICC: The class which was visited met in a large trailer which was adequate in space and desks. Dr. David Nassaw, the Acting Director, was teaching a Community Studies II course. The class was enthusiastically discussing Franz Fanon's Black Skin, White Masks. Dr. Nassaw also used part of the class period to assist students in developing their final term papers which were due in late May.

The evaluator also visited a Social Welfare course taught by Ms. Prudence Goldblatt. The classroom was not adequate since it was a large lecture room, drab and poorly lighted. The room was designed for approximately 100 or more students (the Social Welfare course had approximately twenty-five students in attendance). In spite of the surroundings, the instructor and students had a lively discussion of Ryan's Blaming the Victim. The students were

responsive, and I had the impression that they had read the assignment with understanding.

A short discussion was held with Ms. Goldblatt when the students were dismissed. This discussion included the course, the work seminar, and other problems which were being experienced by the students and the instructor.

Bedford Stuyvesant: All classes meet in a third floor walk-up building. The building located on Thompkins Street is leased through an arrangement with Restoration Corporation. The room has been poorly re-paneled and the toilet facilities are inadequate. The meeting room does not give the appearance that college classes meet there since there are inadequate blackboards and other materials. In addition, the large room does not provide space for students who may need privacy for studying or others who may need individual tutoring. It is equally striking that SICC is not identified as the institution which sponsors the program there. Discarded materials and an old desk occupy the corner on the other end of the large room.

After some delay, the evaluator was introduced to the instructor who taught Writing Workshop I & II (Henry Evans). The students were prepared for the day's work and immediately began to deal with the assigned work.

The evaluator had an opportunity to talk with a small

group of students about the program and many of its problems. These included the faculty, the college, and the expectations they alleged had been promised. While the students criticized many of the individuals associated with YCS, they indicated that the Bedford Stuyvesant site provided an educational opportunity which would not be available otherwise. Additional questions and issues raised by the students will be discussed throughout this report.

Administration and Faculty Offices: The program's administration and faculty office is located in a permanent building with open offices which are without partitions. These do not offer the privacy which is required to effectively carry out day-to-day program functions.

All-Day Program Evaluation: This evaluator had an opportunity to observe a "Year-End Evaluation Conference" on Monday, May 24, 1976 which was convened by the administration and faculty of YCS. The objective was to provide an opportunity for students to evaluate the program. The session was designed to provide group discussions to enable students to assess the program's goals and their experiences. Some of the comments are discussed in other parts of this report.

IV. Youth and Community Studies Program's Administration, Faculty-Staff and Curriculum

Administration: The program is currently administered by an "Acting" Director who also teaches courses in the Program. (The Director is on leave in Paris for this 1975-76 Academic Year.) It was observed that the Acting Director enjoys the respect and admiration of all the students, both as an administrator and as an instructor. His openness in discussing their problems adds to his positive relationship with students. On the other hand, he is constrained by the "acting" status which causes him to make judgements that he feels are tentative since the status of the permanent Director is less than clear in terms of his returning to the Director's post.

It should be noted that much of the ambivalence experienced by students towards the administration was directed towards the permanent Director, Dr. Stanley Aronowitz. These feelings include unfulfilled promises regarding the program and its objectives, incomplete grades which have not been changed after more than a year, and the students' generalized feelings that he was less than candid with them when it came to program concerns. Moreover, a number of problems continue to be unsolved.

Because of administrative duties, the "Acting Director" has not been able to visit the Bedford Stuyvesant center as he desires, nor does he have the opportunity and time to

articulate the program to other units of CUNY and neighboring institutions of higher education. To some extent, this includes the faculty and administration at SICC. However, he was able to obtain funding in order for an additional staff member to be responsible for many of the on-going daily problems of the Bedford Stuyvesant center. While Bedford Stuyvesant students admire the "Acting Director," they indicate that his expectations are "too high." (This may be a disguised compliment!)

Faculty-Staff: It should be noted that the Acting Director is the only full-time person; others have adjunct appointments, i.e., they are not appointed on regular faculty lines. All staff members teach courses in the program and appear to be enthusiastic about the goals of the program and the response of students. A great deal of mutual respect appears to exist!

While some of the instructors are limited to a prescribed number of hours because of the adjunct appointment, this has the potential of adversely affecting those program activities which require close and extensive supervision, e.g., the work seminar experience. Obviously, these staff members do work extra hours beyond their assignments; the reward can only be realized in terms of the students' progress. This drawback has been discussed in previous evaluation reports.

Curriculum: No attempt will be made to describe the curriculum since this has been accomplished in the FIPSE Report dated February 1, 1974 and November 27, 1974. The program's curriculum and courses continue to be developed principally from the areas listed below. Some additions have been made and these will be noted.

1. Community Studies I, II, III, IV.

   These courses are offered on and off campus. They are designed to be sequential. Full-time instructors teach these. The general offerings are as follows:

   -Dr. D. Nassaw - CS I, IV (on-campus)

   -Mr. D. Coleman - CS II, III (on-campus)

   -Mr. R. Mendez - II (off-campus)

   Community Studies III is not offered off-campus.

2. Urban Institutions course.

   Offerings are as follows:

   -Mr. D. Coleman - off-campus

   -Professors C. Glassman and P. Greenblatt - off-campus

3. Black History.

   This course is offered as a seminar off-campus only. (A new offering.)

4. Skills Development and Training.

   -Writing Workshops - offered to off-campus students only.

   -Regular English courses are taken by on-campus students.

5. Work Seminar.

This course is offered to on-campus students only. Independent study courses may be taken with any staff member. These are supervised by Dr. D. Nassaw.

It should be noted that course syllabi are not given to students in these courses, nor are other course guidelines developed which outline the responsibility of the instructor and the student. Students are not fully clear on what these courses propose to accomplish and the specific areas to be developed and covered.

Students at Bedford Stuyvesant were critical of the sequence in Community Studies courses. They suggested that the sequence was not followed in some cases which means that students with prior courses in the area were grouped with new and/or incoming students. All course sequences are offered at SICC (main campus).

Although Skills Development and Training is listed in the YCS curriculum, students at the Bedford Stuyvesant center indicate a need for a reading course. Moreover, questions may be raised as to whether a writing workshop can adequately meet the needs of students when English courses are not offered to them. It appears that this operates as a disadvantage to Bedford Stuyvesant students not only in terms of transfer credit but also in terms of their writing and

general communication competencies which are needed generally in all college courses.

Mathematics is not offered to Bedford Stuyvesant students. Similar problems will be experienced in this area also. (Problems in English and Mathematics should be resolved immediately.) Some attempt was made to offer a natural science course, but this proved unsatisfactory because of the instructor's theoretical approach and other problems relating to his general understanding of these students. These courses should be offered if they have been projected as an integral part of Youth and Community Studies program.

Supportive Services: These services are principally handled by one person at the Bedford Stuyvesant center, Mr. Everett Hughes. For some time, these services were non-existent. Faculty and students indicated that he has been solely responsible for assisting in the resolution of some student problems in this area with cooperation from offices at SICC. Hughes' interest in the YCS students' personal and social concerns has caused him to become a valuable person to have on the staff. He has performed adequately under these circumstances. Also, his interest and commitment to these students should be considered in continuing his services to the YCS program. It should be noted that students on the

SICC campus use the existing Student Personnel Offices for supportive services.

There are areas which require additional development for Bedford Stuyvesant students, and these will be outlined in the section on recommendations.

YCS Student Identification with SICC: Students studying on the campus appear to identify with the program and the entire campus; they have all the faculty and student services available to them as do other students. Seemingly, there is a natural identification with the campus. The majority of SICC-YCS students live, work, and socialize in the immediate island area.

On the other hand, students in the Bedford Stuyvesant Program do not have this close identification with the college. Because of the distance from the main campus, their contacts are sporadic and few. They have not experienced campus life and ways in which an institution functions on a day-to-day basis. No doubt, this generates negative feelings when problems arise. Supportive services which were discussed earlier could help to bridge this gap!

There continues to be some question by students regarding the requirements for graduation and the number of credits one may expect to have transferred. A clearer definition of YCS would help to alleviate this dilemma. (The Reid-Brown

Evaluation Report calls attention to this problem.)

Finally, there is mounting anxiety among faculty and students concerning the continuance of the program when the present funding year is ended. The Acting Director has submitted a proposal for re-funding. The future of the program could be jeopardized since the City University has experienced deep cuts in all of its colleges and programs. At this time, no one knows whether the program will be funded for the Academic Year 1976-77.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations for Future Program Development

It should be emphasized that it is the view of this evaluator that this program should be saved, i.e., funded for the next academic year. The approach to community and societal problems is an innovative one! At the same time, it has provided an opportunity for poor and minority students to obtain educational experiences at the freshman and sophomore years--an experience which would otherwise be unavailable to many of these students, particularly those in Bedford Stuyvesant.

Administrators of the program should review past evaluation reports which call attention to weaknesses in the program. Some of these recommendations continue to remain unsolved. (Particular attention is called to the Brown-Reid Report, pp20-24, April, 1975.)

The following recommendations are suggested:

1. The Bedford Stuyvesant center should be fully developed into a college center with all available supportive services. It is recognized that some of these services have been minimally available through the leadership and interest of Mr. Everett Hughes; however, these services should be expanded. In addition, it may be necessary to appoint an individual who is competent in psychological services since some of the students may require counseling and advisement which point to other personal needs. (Some of these concerns may be handled in groups.)

This would add to the commitment of Staten Island Community College in their support of this program. Moreover, the influence of this support should be buttressed by the Restoration Corporation--a community-based organization--and it should be visible to YCS, a special college program which deals with community and societal problems. It should be noted that the relationship of Restoration Corporation and Staten Island Community College is not clear.

2. The identification of this program with Staten Island Community College in the Bedford Stuyvesant Community should be assessed. In this regard, students should be required to complete some work at the campus prior to graduation. This requirement would facilitate the relationship and identification with the sponsoring institution and assist students in adjusting to the campus environment. Program activities such as seminars, colliquiums, or workshops are illustrative. Some of these may have to be scheduled on a Saturday or Sunday where feasible.

3. Articulation appears to be a problem. Hence, the goals and mission of Youth and Community Studies should be discussed with other units of the City University as well as institutions in the private sector. A publication or brochure should be developed which describes all features of YCS including curriculum, course credit, philosophy, goals, etc. (It would serve the valuable purpose of understanding the program and recruiting new students.)

4. While there is course and curriculum emphasis upon important social thinkers such as Engels, Fanon, Marx, and Freud, it appears that other works do not receive the same attention. It seems that Youth and Community Services students should be <u>required</u> to take courses in Afro-American History, or Black History, Puerto Rican History, and Anthropology. These courses should cover the contributions of mid-twentieth century social thinkers.

5. The Work Seminar course needs re-organization so that it can be supervised by a full-time individual. The present adjunct arrangement precludes thorough coverage of this important activity; particularly, seminar assignments have been drastically affected by economic cut-backs in the City as well as at the City University. This important curriculum requirement needs full supervision and if possible, should be expanded in order for work assignment supervisors to participate in the student evaluation process.

6. All courses should be clearly defined by a syllabus. These descriptions should include course content, class requirements, material to be covered, special assignments, and other policies and practices which relate to the responsibilities of the instructor and the student. These should be readily available to students and others requesting information and advice on program offerings.

7. The problems and difficulties relating to offering English, mathematics, reading, and natural science at Bedford Stuyvesant should receive priority. Moreover, these basic courses have implications for competencies in other offerings.

8. A number of incomplete grades continue to be unresolved. While the present Acting Director has initiated efforts to clear them, he needs the cooperation of others. Obviously, this will cause problems for students who wish to transfer. Moreover, the prescribed period for removing "I" grades may expire, thus causing a student to receive an unwarranted failing grade. (The Reid-Brown Report, 1975, page 23, discusses this problem.)

9. The development of an active program Advisory Committee should be considered at SICC and Bedford Stuyvesant. Membership in this group should include community representatives, program students and other sectors of the college community.

10. Religious institutions, churches, and other local community organizations should be invited to become involved in the support of YCS, particularly in Bedford Stuyvesant. This relationship will generate overall assistance and support. Moreover, these groups may be approached regarding the assignment of students who are enrolled in the Work Seminar course.

11. The status of the Director of the YCS program should be clarified. At the present time, it is difficult for the "Acting Director" to proceed deliberately since this matter is not resolved.

Finally, it appears that students in the Bedford Stuyvesant program are being short-changed in terms of course offerings, supportive services and facilities. This disproportionate educational experience should be assessed since it risks the future continuance of the Youth and Community Studies Program. With new and important commitments from Staten Island Community College and Restoration Corporation, the overall results should translate into positive changes which will affect many of the recommendations in this report.

Appendix I

Description of courses developed by Youth and Community Studies Program was removed from this document prior to its being submitted to the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

Appendix II

| | OFF CAMPUS | ON CAMPUS | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|
| STUDENTS WITH FULL TIME RESPONSIBILITIES IN ADDITION TO STUDIES | | | |
| Students with full time responsibilities who have transferred/graduated | 100% | 58% | 79% |
| Students without full time responsibilities who have transferred/graduated | 0% | 42% | 21% |
| Current Students with full time responsibilities | 73% | 60% | 66.5% |
| Current Students with full time responsibilities | 27% | 40% | 33.5% |

"full time responsibilities in addition to studies" means that a student has a full time job and/or full time household responsibilities in addition to YCS studies.

Final Report:

The State University of New York at Stony Brook.

November 1, 1976

# Annual Report and Final Evaluation for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education

## Introduction

An unusual circumstance, the confluence of interdependent streams at flood season, permits the merger of several reports and assessments of the Program in Youth and Community Studies. The university requires an Annual Report designed to inform campus and Albany. The FUnd for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education requires an annual evaluation of its funded projects. This year marks the end of a three year F.I.P.S.E. grant. In this combined report, the writer (Y.C.S. chairman) will assess the history, accomplishments, current state and future of Y.C.S. The report will be written in the spirit characterized by Dr. Seymour Sarason of Yale who evaluated Y.C.S. at the end of the 1974-5 academic year and wrote:

> "...everyone with whom I had discussions was more candid in his evaluation of the program than is the case of any other evaluation in which I have ever participated. It is surprising but true that I never got the feeling that anyone was avoiding my direct and probing questions."

This candor is not a claim of absolute truth; although most of what is written is supported by evidence and the interpretations are relatively easy to discern. The document is political in its aim (but not expectation) to effect events as well as explain them. It is more than anything an aesthetic and moral document in the

perceived sense that people and institutions that move against something of value cannot be permitted to do so without an accounting, a pain of recognition. The writer realizes that this document may be upsetting to some decent people who find themselves in an institutional web. They should be upset. The writer is quite willing to face their reasoned judgments.

Current Crisis

Youth and Community Studies is an endangered curriculum. On April 22, 1976 President John Toll told the Y.C.S. chairman that the 1976-7 academic year was to be his last at Stony Brook. Having been informed earlier by the Vice President for Liberal Studies that he was the only Y.C.S. faculty member (a composite faculty of about 3) who was to be reappointed for 1976-7, the chairman assumed that Y.C.S. was being retrenched. The administration, under pressures that will be described later, indicated that this was not the case; the program would continue (a second faculty member would be reappointed half-time). But Y.C.S. is endangered; not immediately perhaps as a thing of the state, a degree-granting academic major (it is endangered in that respect too) but as a force in the lives of students, a service to communities, an example to the university of directions that must be pioneered. In short, it is endangered in those qualities which make it distinct, probing and valuable.

History

Why is this so? Why is this program the most heavily evaluated undergraduate curriculum in the history of Stony Brook, the only

department that can demonstrate (others may be doing it) successful education of what the University's Self-Study, Stony Brook in Transition, has identified as the "Other Stony Brook," academically alienated student, the only department that has moved toward community development (as opposed to internship or technical service) and has broad contacts in the youth, law, environment, church, school institutions of Suffolk County, why has this program reached a time of crisis?

The answer must be sought, briefly as possible, in Y.C.S.' history. The chairman came to Stony Brook in the Spring of 1970 with a mandate from Dr. Sanford Kravitz, Dean of the School of Social Welfare, Dr. Edmund Pellegrino, Vice President for the Health Sciences Center and Dr. Sidney Gelber, then Vice President for Liberal Studies, to develop a curriculum in the School of Social Welfare which integrated the theory and experience of youth work and brought them to bear on the education of graduate social work students. A community-based learning center model rather quickly began to evolve. During the School of Social Welfare planning year however problems - opposition by several key faculty to "clinical" intervention, to community involvement without ideological preparation - made the development of this process-oriented curriculum exceedingly difficult. These curriculum problems and many others resulted in the writer and four other faculty (a majority of the on-board faculty) asking Dr. Pellegrino to remove the Dean. This did not occur. The writer, determined to implement the developing program under a compatible auspice and with the assistance of Dr. Pellegrino and Dr. Gelber was trans-

ferred (most of the other protesting faculty stayed) at his request to the Department of Psychiatry and the Division of Social Sciences and Humanities with the understanding that the program would be developed as a link between the Health Sciences Center and the College of Arts & Sciences. This too did not work: pressures from Dean Kravitz; the withdrawal by Dr. Pellegrino of the additional line that was to support the writer's position, which was to be submitted for tenure review; withdrawal of support by a key Division of Social Sciences and Humanities faculty member, Daniel Fox, writ finis to Health Science Center auspice for the program.

Interest in the curriculum led Dr. Gelber, by then, Academic Vice President, to take steps to institute the program in the College of Arts & Sciences. He formed a distinguished (see addendum) ad hoc committee to study the proposal for a liberal arts curriculum and make recommendations. They recommended a five year experimental program. A formal proposal with component courses was composed (for two years previously, a small number of undergraduates using independent study rubrics, about forty in an approved six credit Arts & Sciences course and about thirty community professionals enrolled in a continuing education course were piloting the curriculum. Extensive community contacts with youth agencies and schools were being built). An Advisory Board was formed. Curricular approval for a concentration was obtained from the Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee. Later, (1974) the Curriculum Committee and Albany approved an academic major, changing the status of Y.C.S. from experimental to ongoing although hardly ending testing and evaluation. The program was established

as an autonomous unit, differing from the various "interdisciplinary" programs in having a larger core curriculum but similar to them in lacking departmental status; the ability to tenure. The writer, now de-departmentalized, was given a series of one year contracts: part-time academic appointment and part-time program director to avoid the tenure problem.

Paralleling the development of Y.C.S. as a formal academic major, were events which were to prove first helpful and later troublesome. The problem, even at a time of budget expansion, of getting adequate funding to bring on the needed "critical mass" (about three) of interdisciplinary faculty and getting the President's support for institutionalizing the program were great. Seeking to deal with these problems, the writer contacted a former colleague Dr. William Birenbaum, President of Staten Island Community College. Dr. Birenbaum was taken with the curriculum ideas and suggested that Stony Brook and Staten Island develop parallel Y.C.S. programs based on them and form a consortium. He interested Chancellors Boyer and Kibbee in the idea. A meeting was arranged in which the Chancellors (Dr. Boyer sent a representative) and the Presidents agreed that Youth and Community Studies programs would be instituted on both campuses; a consortium formed, a small programmatic link between C.U.N.Y. and S.U.N.Y. A grant request was formulated by the writer to the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Time deadlines - the difficulty of processing a grant through two Research Foundations, resulted in a submission through C.U.N.Y. (which also allowed a 7% Indirect Cost saving precious dollars for program) with a clear understanding that the funds would be divided by the two institutions.

Dr. Toll was, by accounts and direct observation, unhappy with the arrangement. He felt the Chancellors' involvement was imposed upon him; that the Stony Brook Y.C.S. program (which conceived and implemented the curriculum) was moving outside of the institution. After the grant was made, he raised questions about Stony Brook's participation and future commitment (in fairness, the President from the beginning never committed institutionalization). The Executive Vice President and Academic Vice President worked out satisfactory arrangements for the three year grant period but Dr. Toll's feelings about the program and chairman (evidently) persisted 3-4 years later.

The program was begun then - partially funded by the F.I.P.S.E. grant - in the Fall of 1973. By the 1974-5 year it had been approved as an academic major. Two exciting years (see section on curriculum) culminated in Dr. Sarason's evaluation.

> "The more I reviewed what I had learned and observed, and contrasted that with what I new of other undergraduate community programs, the more I was driven to the conclusion that this is the best program I know about."

The third year of the (decreasing) grant proved to be one of great strain. S.U.N.Y. resources were tightening. Programs were being reviewed. Y.C.S. was reviewed in the summer of 1975 by an administrative group under Dr. Gelber and found to be filling needs in relating students to communities. It was evaluated, as part of a general departmental review by the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts & Sciences and found to be very strong. Because of the tightening financial situation, the administration

launched reviews of a number of programs and small departments. This concentration on programs is interesting but not surprising. The Curriculum Committee evaluation of Arts & Sciences departmental and program curricula indicated - consistent with the Self-Study - that the undergraduate curricula of many departments was in very bad shape. The Curriculum Committee brought pressures to bear on its faculty colleagues; the currency of pressure being the committee's power to approve or disapprove new courses. While the Vice President for Liberal Studies developed useful budget hearings for the first time, hearings to air curriculum and support questions, there is little evidence that the findings and those of the Curriculum Committee about the undergraduate component were brought to bear on funding departments: the strength (opposed to work load) of undergraduate studies took a distinct back seat to departments' graduate and research needs. The programs were more vulnerable[1] - non-departmental, non-tenure bearing, created in the interstices of the university to meet student and curricular needs but not part of the superstructure. In recognition of this fact of life, administration moved in some ways. Dr. Gelber spoke for several years about finding a way for non-departmental, senior faculty to be considered for tenure. One approach, which also dealt with curriculum coordination in an administrative way, was to reconceive the existing Social Science Interdisciplinary Program as an umbrella for a number of programs;

---

1 The Elementary Education Department was vulnerable too. Never regarded (meant to be?) a strong curriculum, it faced a sharp decline in the number of teaching jobs for its graduates.

an umbrella that would be tenure bearing. This idea was organizationally apt because, when the Elementary Education Department was retrenched several of its tenured faculty were transferred to Social Science. If Social Science had tenured faculty, it could be tenure-bearing, so the reasoning may have gone (subsequent events cast doubt on the idea). Programmatically, the plan was less apt. Social Science had not distinguished itself as a curriculum. It was sparsely funded. Y.C.S. should have been the center of a reorganization effort (see footnote on the Collegiate Center - below).

In the review of programs then, the Vice President for Liberal Studies, in consultation with the Faculty Senate, appointed a senior faculty committee (see addendum) to evaluate Y.C.S. and make recommendations for its future. The Review Committee, as all the others, found the program to be meeting important needs. It recommended transfer under the Social Science umbrella; continued autonomy for the major; greater contact with the departments in helping them develop community study opportunities for students (Y.C.S. was never insular but its separate structure and skimpy funding did not permit formal curricular interaction with departments[2]); an austerity budget with two full-time faculty and adjuncts; tenure for the chairman. It was this Review Committee

---

2 A proposal for a Collegiate Center for Community Studies, following the Self-Study and Faculty Senate recommendations, was developed during 1975-6. It provided for thematic clusters (departmental) on community study themes; a freshmen program; continuing education; research, training, internship in community settings. Some eleven departmental chairpersons indicated a wish to participate. The administration - without stating reasons - chose not to make the proposal a cornerstone of its undergraduate reform perhaps because of the perceived marginality of the Y.C.S. organizing locus. It moved instead on Professor Patrick Hill's excellent proposal to form thematic

recommendation that was background to the President's decision to terminate the Y.C.S. chairman, against (also) the explicit or tacit recommendations of the Academic Vice President, Vice President for Liberal Studies, Provost for the Social Sciences, Dean for Undergraduate Studies and (later) Arts & Sciences Curriculum Committee; without consideration of the effects on the Y.C.S. curriculum and program future. That future (at least immediate future) could not be fudged however. The established value and reputation of the program, the student demand, the concern of the Review Committee, Curriculum Committee and officers of the Faculty Senate, perhaps most important the necessity of current Y.C.S. majors' courses of study to be completed; all created pressures to maintain the formal existence of the program. The steeply uphill struggle now, a struggle in which the Curriculum Committee, Review Committee, Faculty Senate and Y.C.S. are involved, is to see that the university commits adequate resources and conditions for faculty recruitment and retention to maintain the value - not just the existence - of the program. Failing this commitment all parties (including Truth) will be better served by a real, as opposed to closet, retrenchment.

This then is the brief history of Y.C.S. at Stony Brook. Before interpreting the reasons for the crisis that engulfs the

---

2 (continued)
clusters out of existing courses; a proposal which could reach goodly numbers of students and have no tenure implications since it federated existing courses. Professor Hill's and the writer's ideas were the only substantial curriculum generating proposals put forth. They should not have been put in competition: one organized what was; the other pioneered new directions. Aside from the valuable but uneven tightening of the existing curriculum in department's response to Curriculum Committee pressures, Professor Hill's program now bears the weight of administration response to its own generated study which indicated that two-thirds of the students were deeply alienated from their academic studies. All deliberate speed.

program, it is necessary to describe the value that has been established.

Curriculum

The evolution of the curriculum even, during its time at the School of Social Welfare, moved from an emphasis on professional education to liberal education. When one examined the question closely, "What do changes in the values of the youth population mean for the training of youth workers?", one was led at this time of cultural upheaval less to technical and skill dimensions of professional practice than to an examination of changing culture, values, concepts of community, politics, economics, etc. The curriculum then became a network of forces:
The experiential world of the students; the needs of community institutions and groups; the academic goals (liberal learning, skill development) of the program. The resolution, accommodation and conflict among those forces is the history of the curriculum thusfar and the beacon to its future needs. This report will summarize curriculum progress and prospects. Evidence from the two external evaluations, two internal evaluations, Y.C.S. Review Committee report, student papers which support the summary has been supplied to the university administration and F.I.P.S.E. and/or is available. Some program and curricular problems that arose this year will be described and analyzed.

The values that Y.C.S. has created with its students are as simple to state as they are - the Stony Brook Self-Study amply documents - difficult to attain. A Y.C.S. student writes in her final (Spring 1976) self-reflection paper:

"Looking back on the principal mode of education that guided me through the university, I realize that Y.C.S., in the long run, did not serve to teach me new thoughts or ideas so much as how to use and expand my mind. This, combined with the more 'practical courses' (in the sense of learning more factual knowledge), is an infinitely rewarding combination. I feel that regardless of what political, economic or social crises I may encounter, I have developed a base for understanding the world. I am not saying that this is not going to change because I think it will according to my continued growth but I am grateful for the opportunity I had to learn about me (emphasis supplied) in relation to the world."

This comment captures the effects of the Y.C.S. curriculum on the great majority of its students - effects with the majority that range from marked to profound - in helping them to actively pursue learning. Importantly, the program is not viewed by insiders - as it would be by uninformed outsiders who move from the label "community studies" to a categorization of career and skill orientation - as vocational or practical in nature. Rather it is a way of connecting up (and developing) self concerns with ideas and social events. Many students (at the time, uninformed outsiders) came to Y.C.S. hoping to get practical experience only to find they had to push themselves to get a rounded perception through research, interviews, readings. At best, the program produces the environment that most good social scientists exemplify; a connection between burning personal concerns and

social issues. Unfortunately most curricula in the social sciences and humanities do not permit the students to replicate the set of experiences which formed the teachers. Instead the students memorize facts and ideas.

Y.C.S. imparts the perspective of the engaged outsider trying to understand community and contribute to it. The student is typically also working in a team with other students and faculty, experiencing the rewards and conflicts of social learning. Thus there are processes within processes. The outside community and the inside learning community are experienced and studied as models of human institutions. The self is tested again and again as interviewer, planner, researcher, group member, student but more than student. Explanatory concepts from sociology, psychology, philosophy, social planning, law, political science are brought to bear on the community experience.

If this description of the curriculum sounds hard to believe, the evidence is there to be consulted. If it sounds quaint it is perhaps because the reader has been conditioned not to seriously consider the effects of education. The writer has written in this vein (also with much hard evidence) in previous annual reports, almost challenging recognition or refutation. The university administration is so bent however on dealing with organization, funds and numbers, so sophisticatedly (unconsciously) attuned to the prevailing extra-curricular concerns, in a minority of cases so unconcerned about undergraduate education, that these statements, and the reality behind them are filtered through administrative and program lenses (internship, career

orientation, F.T.E.'s experiential) which permit them to be understood and (not) dealt with. More about this later.

Several categories that can be understood readily:

Student Demand

With publicity limited (catalog and word of mouth) this year - because the program has not wanted to encourage demands it could not meet - about 70 students have applied for admission as majors next year. At least five transfer students indicated that they were coming to Stony Brook specifically to enroll in Y.C.S. The reaction of many students - told that Y.C.S. could not accommodate the demand because it was being cut in resources - leaves little doubt that the program loomed important in their plans. Several students literally cried.

Y.C.S. Graduates' Futures

A rough tabulation of Y.C.S. "graduate's" progress has been made. Three groups are included:

A) Undergraduate students participating in the pilot phase of the program

B) Students concentrating (typically 20-30 credits) in Y.C.S. - before it was a major or as a supplement to another academic major

C) Students majoring in Y.C.S.

The period covered is 5 years. Job and graduate school outcomes are intermingled - a student may have worked for a year before going to graduate school. Results for the 1976 graduating class are not completely in. Employment opportunities have suffered during the past two years due to the economic recession. The rough tabulations (N of 45) are:

Graduate School

About 60% of the Y.C.S. "graduates" are in graduate schools. Within this group, about 40% have been admitted to Schools of Social Welfare, 20% to Schools of Law and 40% to graduate programs of Counselling, Public Administration, Urban & Policy Sciences, Philosophy, Clinical Psychology.

Qualitatively, the students have been admitted to good schools: Berkeley, University of Pennsylvania, University of Chicago, Washington University at St. Louis. A number of students have reported that their graduate program interview left little doubt that the Y.C.S. curriculum experience was a major factor in their admittance.

Jobs

About 60% of Y.C.S. "graduates" have found work at the BA level in the human service occupations: youth agencies, corrections departments, drug programs, social services, planning departments.

About 30% have found work in non-human services occupations: clerks, taxi drivers, employment agencies.

About 10% are or have been unemployed.

Again, qualitative evidence indicates that participation in the Y.C.S. curriculum is a highly favorable factor in getting jobs. The recession has cut down on the number of human service jobs. A number of our students have found themselves over the past 1-2 years being seriously considered (usually losing out) for jobs in competition with MSW's. A number of our graduates have moved quickly into positions of responsibility in social service agencies (e.g. Smithhaven Ministries).

Problems

This section will deal with problems that surfaced this (1975-6) academic year and ongoing areas of need and development in the curriculum. The two are not unrelated.

The 1975-6 year has seen (for the first time in its history) great stress on faculty and students centered around the Wednesday seminars; weekly seminars whose purpose was to integrate the work of the three sequences - community, law and social policy, schooling. Each sequence develops a number of field research projects. Each conducts a weekly sequence seminar to analyze the field research and discuss the associated readings. The Wednesday seminars had throughout Y.C.S. history been a problem. Students tended to see the sequence or even subsequence project as the primary focus. Some skill workshops and theoretical presentations had been successful but the overall integrative thrust of the Wednesday seminars was not being maximally achieved. The chairman believed that one of the reasons for the lack of success was the tendency toward entropy in the sequences. With a limited, overworked faculty (some part-time) having to supervise the field studies and sequence seminars, it was difficult to focus attention on common intellectual and experiential themes. To deal with this problem the chairman decided to use the Master Learner concept of Professor Patrick Hill - whose principal authorship of the Self-Study, Stony Brook in Transition has been cited so admiringly in these pages. The Master Learner as Professor Hill described him-her would follow the students through their courses, learning with them and bringing his-her experience and sophistication to bear on helping the students integrate their course work. It was reasoned that the Y.C.S. curriculum was an ideal testing

ground for the concept. The curricular grounds for the experiment were paramount but two additional factors were not unimportant. The chairman, knowing the F.I.P.S.E. grant was running out saw the need to spend more energy on proposal writing - fund raising. There were premonitions that a time of crisis was approaching. There was also the factor of exhaustion. After six years of founding, transferring, teaching, administering, ... scrambling, undergoing reviews, the chairman was tired. He reasoned that the Master Teacher role would provide a needed diversion; that this year he would not teach a sequence too.

Faculty were approached with the idea and, with one significant exception, were enthusiastic. The exception was a young instructor, Leonard Mell, who had been active as an undergraduate student in the time of the program's creation; and in the absence of lines available to recruit senior faculty had been engaged on a line that administration supplied expressly for him. He had worked intensively with a small student sequence the year before, with good results (studying university and faculty structure and student movements) but with a tendency toward insularity and a balance of ideological over experiential perspectives. He was strongly against the new curricular arrangement and when it was instituted proceeded to withdraw his sequence students from exposure to the chairman. Apparently he felt the arrangement was a threat to the integrity of his teaching. Feeling this strongly - but being dependent on the chairman for evaluation of his faculty status - he must have been in a state of conflict. What can be reported is that beginning at the time that his sequence students were not available to the chairman, they (more accurately 4 of the 10) in the sequence began to raise at the Wednesday seminars serious

questions about the internal, decision-making processes of the program. The chairman had engaged (on the grant) an adjunct faculty member, Joseph Maniscalco, who the year before had brilliantly combined self-analysis and community analysis with a smaller group (12) to attempt to help him do the same with the total (Wednesday) student group (40). The adjunct's technique was to press questions of authority and control to get the students to see resistances in themselves and in communities to self-direction. Soon after the semester began he became (physically) ill. This fact and the larger group size made it more difficult for him to apply his teaching techniques. These difficulties were seized upon by the few students (the majority were discontent with the sessions but ready to explore further) demanding his removal. This was not acceptable. Physical deterioration forced him to leave by the end of the semester. The chairman took over his role but with differing techniques - structured content discussions. The attacks continued, the instructor joining more overtly in them.

At the semester break, the instructor indicated that several (of the non-protesting students) in his sequence were leaving. He wanted to replace them to get this class to size. Permission was reluctantly given; reluctantly because the curriculum is designed as year-long and students entering in the spring semester are at a disadvantage; and reluctantly also because it was clear that reinforcements were being sought. Instead of admitting 2-3 students the instructor admitted 14, 10 of whom were taking less than the 10 credits that was customary and necessary to meet the field study obligations. The existence of these students

was not discovered until class rosters were sent and, although steps were initiated, until it was too late to de-register them without inflicting severe academic hardships. These students - more accurately again, about half of them - joined the power confrontations taking place at the Wednesday seminars. The bulk of students from the other sequences and indeed the faculty did not know how to deal effectively with the challenge. Principles of democracy and process so dear to the program prevented unilateral invocation of authority. More structure was introduced but attendance at the seminars waned (from a beginning 95% to about 50% - the average attendance at Stony Brook classes). The students were drained and passive (the writer is still searching for a satisfactory explanation of why the students, faculty and himself were not more effective in dealing with the 1960's type power play) and focused their efforts exclusively on their sequence studies. The instructor, needless to say is not being renewed. Ironically his temporary line was cut by the State before the department acted.

Thus the Master Learner experiment failed (although the chairman was able to engage students in two of the sequences and enlarge their perspective). Why has so much effort gone into its description? Not because the overall quality of the students' work declined markedly over past years. It did decline, by faculty assessment, the fall semester but spring 1976 papers of two of the sequences (as of this writing the instructor's students' papers have not been seen) were generally of excellent quality. The integrating seminars have never been the curriculum high point. Several reasons for the self-flagellation. First, the events happened. They were a major source of concern and pain

for students and faculty. Second, they point to, by their very excess, the structural problems that beset such a program through lack of institutional support. Personality conflicts were obviously not absent. But the inability to recruit and retain experienced faculty (such as the sociologist Tom Cottle who was interested but could not consider a one year appointment); the realities of faculty participation in a faculty that is mostly part-time and adjunct were more determinative of the problem and the difficulty in dealing with it. About the only deficit that external (and internal) reviews consistently point out is the lack of systematic theoretical input into the field studies. The kind of input that the Wednesday seminars were to supply. The problem here too is largely structural, the need for a critical mass of faculty who can, without overspecializing, more systematically integrate theory and technique into the preparation for, conduct and interpretation of the field studies. At the risk of appearing defensive the writer adds that locating the problem in the lack of university support as opposed to faculty and chairman performance is not meant to excuse the latter (the chairman has been accused of being too hard on faculty and on himself). Nor is it meant to imply that students in the departmental social science curricula are more theoretically sophisticated. On the contrary, the Y.C.S. style of analysis and field exploration combined with the (typically) four academic year courses that Y.C.S. students take in the social sciences, yields a much stronger appreciation of the role of concept and theory than is usually the case. The problem is, Y.C.S. could be doing so much better.

Community

A penultimate problem area: engagement with community. As indicated earlier, Y.C.S. has in its six year history developed broad and deep ties in the Long Island (largely Suffolk County) community. The youth-serving institutions (including schools) have been a major focus. Projects with church organizations are beginning. With the appointment (under the F.I.P.S.E. grant) of Professor Cummings many ties have been established to institutions of law (Suffolk County Bar Association, Civil Liberties Union, Probation Department) and environmental groups. Y.C.S. student papers have been used as reference resources by the Bi-County Planning Commission. Program evaluation, planning, lay board training surveys, community forums have all been conducted by the program. Y.C.S. projects encompass six of the ten Towns in Suffolk County; the full range of ethnic, racial and social classes in Suffolk communities.

The problem parallel to that of the depth of theoretical understanding inculcated by Y.C.S., is the depth of "penetration of the community"; the amount of community development that can be engendered. In the ideal situation, the closer the program and its students come to associate with the community institution or group, the more they come to understand it and the more they are able to work for its development. Y.C.S. has only begun to scratch the surface of community development.

A final problem area: the Staten Island - Stony Brook consortium. One of the focal interests of F.I.P.S.E and, as indicated one of the focal concerns of President Toll, was the consortium activities of the two institutions. This has not been a strong point. Several Staten Island Y.C.S. students

enrolled at Stony Brook. A number of joint colloquia were held. The directors were in reasonably regular contact. But the distance (about 80 miles) between the two institutions, the struggles that each Y.C.S. program had to wage for excellence and survival militated against a close consortium. The writer - through his previous consultantship with the Bedford Stuyvessant Restoration Corporation - helped arrange for Staten Island Y.C.S. to form a curriculum center with that excellent community development corporation. Much effort and many meetings went into a plan to bring the Stony Brook Y.C.S. to Bedford Stuyvessant, making a four year program. This would have required additional resources for a separate unit - distances precluded regular travel of Stony Brook faculty and students west or Bedford Stuyvessant students east - resources that are not available. The idea remains a fond hope of the chairman who admires the Restoration Corporation accomplishments and the curriculum that Staten Island Community College has established there.

The evaluation of the consortium will have to rest almost exclusively on the strengths or weaknesses of the separate institutional programs.

The Future of Y.C.S.

In the most obvious sense it is not difficult to understand why a small, innovative program is threatened with dissipation or dissolution at a time of fiscal retrenchment. That is the way of the world. More closely considered however, the threat, no less real, is not so obvious. Stony Brook as many universities is faced with conditions that require adaptation and change; with

the need to develop curricular models which made the change more than mechanical. Liberal undergraduate education, our Self-Study shows, is in crisis. Two-thirds of the Stony Brook students are deeply alienated academically. Graduate education can no longer guarantee its products a place in the academic firmament. The professors can't replicate themselves. The State Master Plan recognizes the need for innovation at undergraduate and graduate levels; for curricula which partake both of liberal learning and career preparation; for new modes of community education; for public service.

Y.C.S. is one already tested model that can approach the aims of the Master Plan. It is - again, recognition or refutation is requested - the most innovative, evaluated undergraduate program in Stony Brook's history. It can play a unique role in public service.[3] Through the proposed Collegiate Center for Community Studies and the Community University Program (a less elaborate plan than the Collegiate Center which emphasizes enrolling the residents of the communities in which Y.C.S. field studies are being conducted, in courses, planning activities which aim at community development.),

---

3 The Self-Study Committee on Public Service documented the dearth of public service commitment at Stony Brook. The University's primary service is in being Suffolk County's largest employer; an important but passive function. Undergraduates volunteer in hospital wards. Graduate students intern in field placements. Schools like Urban & Policy Science contract for technical assistance to government. But public service, in the land grant tradition of integrating research, teaching and community application is scarce.

it can open undergraduate graduate, continuing education for departments. What would be necessary to realize the Y.C.S. potential? At the very least, a core faculty of three on regular tenure University bearing lines with a mandate to develop the core Y.C.S. curriculum and engage the departments. At best, a core faculty of 7-10, small department size. The grid plan, adopted by Faculty Senate resolution, in which the departments share faculty (and get the F.T.E.'s) with cross departmental programs, makes these projections easily achievable. Even with the current fiscal draught, rigorously applied criteria for undergraduate and public service excellence could produce non-grid core lines. Monies seem to be found when the President sees the need.

Leaving the world of fantasy, what will happen to Y.C.S.? The result is sadly predictable. The chairman's departure will leave only a half-time faculty member who understands, and has experience in, the Y.C.S. heritage; no one with close ties to the faculty (the chairman has served on the Committee to Reform Undergraduate Education, Committee on Public Service, as member and chairman of the Curriculum Committee): no one in short to fight for the program. The President's written comments to the chairman (May 7 letter), "...we expect the program in youth and community studies to continue in so far as possible (emphasis added); the Vice President for Liberal Studies, and Provost for the Social Sciences' commitment of 1.5 lives for "at least three years" (May 17) foretell the future accurately: fast or faster incorporation into umbrella divisions such as Social Science; large scale internships. Youth & Community Studies will disappear into the maw.

And so my reader, who has surely followed this quaint narrative thusfar out of duty, interest or anger, we arrive at the final question, "Why is Y.C.S. being dismantled?" Fielding that question, one must resort (with acknowledgement to Frances FitzGerald who applied the terms to social phenomena) to a Special Theory and a General Theory. The Special Theory holds that the accomplishments and potentials of Y.C.S. are not seen because it is so small and peripheral. A senior Stony Brook social scientist called it "a flea on the back of a dog" (to which the reply, "Dogs who are sick get infested with fleas.") How can something put in the category of program,[4] led by a non-tenured (if not young) faculty member, lead the cause of educational reform? The General Theory is startling in its simplicity. There is no cause to lead because education is not an important concern of the university. Stony Brook, following and epitomizing a trend, is a knowledge and technology factory. The President's values and leadership establish, and share with administrators and faculty,[5] the pattern: the production of traditional scholarship

4 During the April 22 notice of termination meeting, the President enjoined that Y.C.S. be integrated into the "regular" curriculum.

5 The President is clearly dominant in a weak force field of administration, faculty and students, as this passing Y.C.S. episode again illustrates. He is genuinely - the writer believes - puzzled by them. In his extremely intelligent but rhinocerian charge for growth and academic prestige, he knows that many of his values are shared. He treats the faculty's griping, negative evaluations, even censures, mostly avuncularly (although they must hurt him). Their passivity is apparent. But having been entrusted with the responsibility of pioneering the "Berkeley of the East", and having worked enormously hard, he does not grasp (in the sense of felt concern) their wish for a civilized academic and physical environment. There is still land to clear.

for scholarly consumption while undergraduates (paraphrasing the President) must get a lot of their education out of the classroom; the importation of "name" scholars while teaching and public service are almost never determinative in recruitment, promotion and tenure; the development of technology, while education of the people in its uses and limits flounders; the serving of the state, while the purpose of the state and its citizens are whispered questions; the employment of workers to build and service the plant, while their children wither in suburban boredom; the garnering of continuing education students to supply the F.T.E.'s for the valued Ph.D. programs, while the faculty wonders what to teach them. And everywhere faculty attempting to pursue honorable traditional careers, beleaguered administrators, hustling or confused students stagger under the production load: most of the exhaustion is of the spiritual variety. And most everyone knows, from the small details of daily intercourse, the overtones and undertones of classes and meetings, that education is not a prime value at Stony Brook. That is why the General Theory is not so startling. And that is why Youth and Community Studies is dying.

A closing poem, imagined out of the Stony Brook experience by the writer of this report (M.T. in the poem), cited in Stony Brook in Transition:

In a cafeteria
The choice criteria (J.J.)
Would locate priorities
Apriori
Then again
Aposteriori (A.B.)
But the steam table
Is able
To mystify
Mixing memory desire (T.S.)
The stew
Becomes entire
And we become (M.T)

Addendum - Steps in the Review and Evaluation of Youth and Community Studies

1. Curriculum proposal and pilot courses evaluated by Ad Hoc Committee appointed by Dr. Sidney Gelber, Academic Vice President: Joseph Katz (Human Development), Patrick Heelan (Philosophy), Robert Lekachman (Economics), Harry Kalish (Psychology), Eli Rubinstein (Psychiatry), John Gagnon (Chairman, Sociology), Alan Entine (Undergraduate Studies), Ellen Fahy (Nursing, Howard Oaks (Dentistry), Lawrence Stolurow (Education)

2. Detailed course proposals, revised curriculum proposal and program implementation evaluated and reviewed by Y.C.S. Advisory Committee appointed by Dr. Gelber: Andrew Casazza (Social Work - Community Representative) David Dickson (English), Norman Goodman (Sociology), Patrick Heelan (Philosophy), Joseph Katz (Human Development), Robert Lekachman (Economics), Richard Robinson (Cooperative College Centers), Ingrid Tiegel (Education), C.N. Yang (Physics), Stanley Yolles (Psychiatry)

3. Detailed curriculum proposal reviewed and recommended by the Experimental Advisory Committee: Bruce Bashford (English), Joel Rosenthal (History), Steven Schwartz (Chemistry), Lawrence Stolurow (Education), Martin Timin (Y.C.S. - non-participating), Thomas Williams (Experimental College)

4. Curriculum reviewed and approved as an academic concentration by the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences.

5. Comprehensive evaluation conducted internally by Y.C.S. faculty at end of first year of program. (Detailed questionnaire to students, faculty associates, community professionals).

6. Evaluation conducted at end of first year by team of outside academicians: Alan Silver (Sociology-Columbia), Ernst Prelinger (Psychology-Yale), Alan Gartner (Human Services-N.Y.U.)

7. Curriculum reviewed and approved as academic major by the Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts & Sciences, Dean for Undergraduate Studies, Academic Vice President, President, State Education Department.

8. Comprehensive evaluation conducted internally at end of second year by Y.C.S. faculty. (Same format as previous internal evaluation).

9. Evaluation conducted at end of second year by Dr. Seymour Sarason, Professor of Psychology at Yale University noted for his writing on the relationship of the social sciences to community.

10. Informal visit and evaluation by the social critic Dwight McDonald.

11. Curriculum reviewed by administrative planning group under Dr. Gelber.
12. Curriculum evaluated as part of general departmental review by Curriculum Committee of the College of Arts & Sciences.
13. Curriculum evaluated by Y.C.S. Review Committee appointed by the Vice President for Liberal Studies:
    Leonard Krasner (Psychology-Chairman), Richard Levine (English), Hanan Selvin (Sociology), June Starr (Anthropology)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 20 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES